



S&H Form: (2/01)

Docket No.: 1349.1276

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Seo-hyun CHO, et al.

Serial No: 10/642,656

Group Art Unit: 2853

Confirmation No. 3051

Filed: August 19, 2003

Examiner: Juanita Dionne Stephens

For: MONOLITHIC IMAGE FORMING APPARATUS PRINT HEAD AND FABRICATION  
METHOD THEREOF

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is responsive to the Office Action mailed January 10, 2005, having a shortened period for response set to expire on February 10, 2005, the following remarks are provided.

I. Provisional Election of Claims Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.142

Applicants provisionally elect Group II (claims 4-30) in response to the preliminary restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action.

II. Applicants Traverse the Requirement

Insofar as Group I (claims 1-3) is concerned, it is believed that claims 1-3 are so closely related to elected claims 4-30 that they should remain in the same application. The elected claims 4-30 are directed to a method including exposing a single photo resist to light and claims 1-3 are drawn to a print head including a chamber/nozzle plate being formed by patterning a photo resist. There have been no references cited to show any necessity for requiring restriction. It is believed, moreover, that evaluation of all sets of claims would not provide an undue burden upon the Examiner at this time in comparison with the additional expense and delay to Applicants in having to protect the additional subject matter recited by the Group I claims by filing a divisional application.

MPEP §803 sets forth the criteria for restriction between patentably distinct inventions. (A) indicates that the inventions must be independent (see MPEP §802.01, §806.04, §808.01) or

distinct as claimed (see MPEP §806.05-806.05(i)); and (B) indicates that there must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP §803.02, §806.04(a)- §806.04(i), §808.01(a) and §808.02). The Examiner has not set forth why there would be a serious burden if restriction is required.

Even if the Examiner considers claims 1-3 to be a separate invention from claims 4-30, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider claims 1-3 (Group I) and claims 4-30 (Group II) together.

III. Conclusion

Upon review of references involved in this field of technology, when considering that the Group I claims are directed to a print head including a chamber/nozzle plate being formed by patterning a photo resist, and elected claims 4-30 are directed to a method including exposing a single photo resist to light, and when all of the other various facts are taken into consideration, it is believed that upon reconsideration of the Examiner's initial restriction requirement, all of the pending claims should be examined in the subject application.

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our deposit account number 19-3935.

Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2-10-05

By:



Michael J. Badagliacca  
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Ste. 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 434-1500